

## LEVEL 1 - 1 OF 2 CASES

Re B and G (Minors) (Custody)

Family Division

[1985] FLR 134

HEARING-DATES: 20, 21, 22, 25, 27, 28, 29 June, 2, 3, 4, 5,  
23 July 1984

23 July 1984

## CATCHWORDS:

Children -- Custody -- Parents members of cult of scientology -- Divorce -- Mother agreeing that father should have custody of children -- Mother subsequently leaving scientology and seeking custody after 5 1/2 years -- Father and stepmother committed scientologists -- Nature of cult of scientology -- Both parents loving and able to offer good home -- Whether nature of scientology justified taking children from the care of the father

## HEADNOTE:

The parents, both committed scientologists, were married in 1973. They had two children, a boy aged 10 and a girl aged 8. After the marriage the parents settled in East Grinstead where the headquarters of scientology was situated and where there was a community of scientologists. In November 1978 the parents separated and each of them went to live with a new partner who were also scientologists. In March 1979 the father began divorce proceedings on the ground of the mother's admitted adultery. In September 1979 a decree nisi was pronounced and it was made absolute in November. Both parties subsequently remarried their respective new partners. Although the mother had wanted custody of the children and wished to invoke custody proceedings she was unable to do so because scientology forbade recourse to the law courts save in special circumstances with permission. She had reluctantly signed two agreements in December 1978 and January 1979 that the father should have custody and that she should have access to the children due to pressure from the father and the scientologists concerned with the case. In May 1980 the scientology 'chaplains court' ruled that custody should remain with the father. In 1982 the mother and stepfather left scientology and they decided that it was better for the children to live with them. In June 1983 she brought custody proceedings. She contended that the children should be committed to her care because if they remained in the father's care they would be brought up as scientologists and would be seriously damaged. It was the father's case that the status quo should not be disturbed and that the children should continue to remain in his care in their close family home and school in East Grinstead where they had been happily settled for the past 5 1/2 years.

At the hearing, expert evidence on the cult of scientology and unchallenged scientology documents were adduced as part of the mother's case. It was common ground that both parents were caring and loving parents who had equally good homes to offer the children and that the children loved both parents and their step-parents.

HELD --

(1) Scientology was both immoral and socially obnoxious. It was corrupt, sinister and dangerous. It was corrupt because it was based on lies and



[1985] FLR 134

deceit and had as its real objective money and power for the leaders. It was sinister because it indulged in infamous practices both to its adherents who did not conform unquestioningly and to outsiders who criticized or opposed it. It was dangerous because it was out to capture people, especially children and impressionable young persons, and indoctrinate and brainwash them so that they became the unquestioning captives and tools of the cult, withdrawn from ordinary thought, living, and relationships with others.

(2) Both parents loved the children and each could offer a warm, close, and stable home. The children had lived with their father and stepmother for 5 1/2 years. A change in custody would be an upheaval and the children would be leaving their real home and family circle. Such a move would be confusing and probably distressing for the children. If the scientology factor did not exist, it would have been in the better interest of the children for them to remain in the care and control of the father with ample access to the mother. However, the scientology factor was such that, as the father and stepmother were committed scientologists, the children would be gravely at risk if they remained in the father's care. Therefore the children would be committed to the care and control of the mother with ample access, subject to conditions, to the father.

CASES-REF-TO:

T(Minors) (Custody: Religious Upbringing), Re (1981) 2 FLR 239

COUNSEL:

Michael Kennedy QC and David Hart for the mother; Robert Johnson QC and Martin Russell for the father.

JUDGMENT-READ:

Cur adv vult

PANEL: Latey J

JUDGMENTBY-1: LATEY J

JUDGMENT-1:

LATEY J: These proceedings concern two children, who are wards of court: a boy aged 10 -- I will call him B -- and a girl aged 8 -- I will call her G.

The decision called for is whether they should remain in their father's care or be transferred into their mother's care.

The mother has been but no longer is a scientologist. The father is a scientologist.

At the heart of the mother's case is the contention that if the children remain in the care of the father they will be brought up as scientologists and will be seriously damaged.

This the father denies: that is to say, he denies that will all its flaws scientology will damage the children. And he says that he intends to bring the children up outside scientology until they are old enough to make their own free choice.

This judgment is being given in open court because it raises matters of some general public moment. In giving it I have tried to ensure that the children



[1985] FLR 134

concerned and their family circles should not be identified. Inevitably, scientologists in and around East Grinstead know who they are. So do scientologists in other parts of the world, as has emerged in the evidence. But it could have serious and damaging effects on these children as they grow up if there were publicity in a wider circle identifying them. From experience over the years I know that the press can be relied on to help in avoiding this where children are involved.

As in every case involving important decisions about children there is a plurality of factors to be weighed, and this is no exception. Scientology and its part in these children's lives now and in the future is one of the factors and an important one. But it is not the only one.

It is important, indeed essential, to stress from the start that this is neither an action against scientology nor a prosecution of it. But willy-nilly scientology is at the centre of the dispute of what is best for the children. The father and his counsel have stressed that they are not here to defend scientology. That is true in the strict sense that the 'church' of scientology is not a party to the proceedings. But they have known from the start what the mother's case is. It is plainly set out in the affidavits. If there remained any doubt it was dispelled by Mr Kennedy for the mother at a hearing for directions in January 1984. The father's solicitor is a scientologist. He has been in communication with the solicitors who act for scientology. There has been ample time and opportunity to assemble and adduce documents and evidence in refutation of the mother's allegations. None has been adduced. Why? Because the mother's case is based largely on scientology's own documents and as the father's counsel, Mr Johnson, candidly, albeit plaintively, said: 'What can we do to refute what is stated in scientology's own documents?'

The hearing has occupied 3 weeks.

Most of it has been focused on scientology, what it is and what are its methods and processes. Knowing virtually nothing about it before this hearing, I was at first surprised at the ambit of the inquiry. I no longer am surprised. It is a very serious matter so far as these children are concerned and the time spent on it has not been excessive.

The parents were married in 1973 and late that year B was born. G was born in December 1975.

The parents separated in November 1978.

In December 1978 and January 1979 the parents signed agreements by virtue of which the father had custody of the children and the mother access.

The mother lived with the step-father and the father lived with the step-mother. All four of them were scientologists.

In March 1979 the father filed a petition for divorce on the ground of the mother's admitted adultery with the step-father.

In September 1979 a decree nisi was pronounced and, by agreement, custody was committed to the father. The divorce was made absolute in November 1979.



[1985] FLR 134

The father and step-mother married.

The mother and step-father also went through a ceremony of marriage believing that they were free to do so. In fact, the step-father's divorce had not gone through. Their union is a stable and happy one, they have a child, a little girl -- A I will call her -- aged 4, and will marry when these proceedings are concluded and when the step-father's parents can be with them for the wedding.

The mother and step-father have made their home in a Commonwealth country and they ask that the children live with them there.

The father and step-mother's marriage is happy and stable. The step-mother has a child, J, by her previous marriage. He is close in age to B. They are very fond of each other. The father and step-mother have a child, S, aged 3 and they are expecting another baby in October.

In May 1980 there began a hearing by the scientology 'chaplin's court' concerning the custody of the children. The decision, inaccurately described as an 'agreement', was that the custody should remain with the father.

In the summer of 1982 when the children were staying with their mother and step-father the mother decided to keep them. She and the step-father had left scientology and she instructed solicitors who wrote to the father.

The father went to the mother's country. The mother took the children to the United States. An order was made for the return of the children to the father and the father went to the United States and recovered them in November 1982.

In June 1983 the mother issued her application for care and control.

In June 1984 the mother and step-father came to England, bought a house in East Grinstead and have been seeing the children regularly. Those are the bare bones of the history. Some elaboration is called for.

After their marriage the father and mother lived in East Grinstead. This is where the headquarters of scientology in this country is situated at Saint Hill Manor. It was until recently the headquarters worldwide. There are many scientologists in the area, some working on the staff, others not on the staff but working for scientology and all under going processing, that is to say auditing and training courses if they can afford it.

As to the separation in 1978, the father said in his affidavit that this was caused by the mother's relationship with the step-father. In his oral evidence the father accepted that he had drawn up what in scientology language is described as a 'doubt formula' in which he said that he considered himself the mother's intellectual superior, that he had doubts about the wisdom of the marriage and that separation had been discussed on a number of occasions.

This, of course, puts a somewhat different complexion on the matter. It is scarcely surprising that with a husband who so regarded her, she became attached to a man who held her in full regard and affection.

As to the custody agreements in 1978 and 1979: the father naturally attaches much weight to them. The mother says that throughout she wanted the children and believed that it would be better for them to be with her. She was a



[1985] FLR 134

committed scientologist at the time. Scientology forbids recourse to the law courts of the country save in special circumstances with permission. The ordinary courts are described in the language of scientology as the 'wog courts', an expression invented by L Ron Hubbard, the founder of the cult. The mother says that she agreed to the father having custody because of the pressure brought to bear on her by the father and the scientologists concerned. The father accepts that she agreed very reluctantly. He accepts that she is a good, loving mother and that the children love her.

At the time of the separation B was aged just 5 and G not quite 3. Had the dispute come to court one cannot be sure, of course, what the decision would have been, but it is not unlikely that children so young would have been put in the care of a good and devoted mother as this one is and always has been.

BNut the question today 5 1/2 years later is what is better for the children in the circumstances as they are now and are likely to be.

The mother agrees that the father loves the children. The children love both their parents and are fond of both step-parents and get on well with them.

As to the 'chaplin's' decision: there were written submissions and some oral hearings. It is noteworthy that from start to finish the father's submission is couched in scientology terminology and stresses all he and step-mother have done for scientology, how correctly they have complied with scientology 'ethics' and how the mother has offended against those 'ethics'. The chaplin, of course, was a scientology official.

Both the mother and step-father wanted to come to court and in about May 1980 she was given permission to do so by the 'assistant guardian' -- of scientology -- on condition that scientology would not be involved. But the father intervened with the guardian and the permission was withdrawn.

It is also to be observed that from March 1979 the mother had been trying to get a hearing before the 'chaplin's court' in the United States. It was refused. It is plain that from first to last the mother wanted the children. She should have gone to the court. As a scientologist then she could not.

As to what happened in the summer of 1982: the father immediately on arrival applied to the courts of the country concerned. The mother's solicitor was instructed. This was on the Friday. On the Saturday the father saw the children at the mother's home. The step-father more than the mother was in touch with the solicitor. On the Saturday the mother took the children to the United States. She did so because she was in fear of losing them. She was cross-examined at some length about whether she did this knowing that an interim order had been made restraining her from removing the children. It does not affect the question I have to decide. It goes to credibility. On the balance of probabilities she was told. Whether and to what extent she grasped it is another matter. As a result of the father's arrival she was in a state of shock. She knew that he had come to get the children if he could and was in great fear that he would succeed. It is understandable that she did not absorb the niceties. She impressed me throughout as a wholly honest person. None the less, she should not have done what she did do. It was done in panic. It was not in the better interest of the children. Nor was it right not to keep the father informed of the children's well-being. Apart from this one matter, so far as I can recall, her credibility has not been impugned.



[1985] FLR 134

So today the mother asks that the children be committed to her care to live with her and the step-father and their small daughter in the country where they have settled. The children have stayed there happily for three lengthy periods. The mother and step-father have bought the house in East Grinstead as a temporary measure to be near the children and see them pending this case.

The father asks that they continue to live with him and the step-mother and the other children in their home in East Grinstead where they are happy and well cared for and at the school where they have been for some time.

If those alone were the factors I think that the scales would probably come down in favour of not disturbing the status quo. Indeed, were it not for the scientology factor, the mother painfully recognizes that she would not now attempt to disturb the status quo and she herself and her counsel have made that plain from the start.

What then is the scientology factor and what weight should be attached to it?

'Horrendous'. 'Sinister'. 'A lot of rotten apples in it'. Those words are not mine. They are the father's own words describing practices of the cult and what it does to people inside and outside it. 'A lot of villains in it'. 'Dreadful things have been done in the name of scientology'. Those words are not mine. They are the words of the father's counsel.

The father at one stage said he thought that these evils had largely been eradicated in 1980. In the light of the evidence not surprisingly that suggestion was not pursued in counsel's final address.

What is scientology?

It is a word invented by L Ron Hubbard, the founder of the cult. The concept, stated very briefly, is that from the beginning of time everyone is reincarnated. Inside each of us is a spiritual being whom Hubbard calls a 'thetan'. This entity is there to help improve one through the millenia. But in each incarnation we are handicapped or the thetan is handicapped by the existence in us of 'engrams' as Hubbard calls them -- bad thoughts or past misdeeds in the present and previous incarnations. Those engrams have to be removed or 'cleared' by certain processes invented by Hubbard. Until they are removed the thetan cannot operate and the scientologist is known as a 'pre-clear'. After they are removed, the scientologist is 'clear' and becomes an 'operative thetan' (OT). From there on he gets 'case gain' -- improvement mentally, physically and spiritually and begins his passage 'up the bridge'. If he transgresses he goes back to the beginning and is reprocessed.

Some might regard this as an extension of the entertaining science fiction which Hubbard used to write before he invented and founded the cult which now in this country and some others is called the 'church of scientology', though in Australia, for example, it calls itself the 'church of the new faith'.

But in an open society such as ours people can believe what they want to and band together and promulgate their beliefs. If people believe that the earth is flat there is nothing to stop them believing so, saying so and joining together to try to persuade others.



[1985] FLR 134

Some of the public proclamations of scientology are unexceptionable, such, for example, that scientologists should obey the law of the land. When one looks at the reality behind the public facade the matter is very different, as will appear.

What are 'dianetics'?

This is another Hubbard-invented word to describe the processes whereby the aims of scientology are furthered. Those processes are 'auditing' and training courses.

'Auditing'

'Auditing is a simple, thoroughly designed means of concentrating the mind to the state of a controlled trance. The aim and result is progressively to enforce loyalty to and identification with scientology to the detriment of one's natural awareness of divergent ways of thinking and outside cultural influences. Love and allegiance are more and more given exclusively to scientology and L Ron Hubbard.'

That is the description of it given by Dr John Gordon Clark. Dr Clark is a Doctor of Medicine of Harvard Medical School and a qualified psychiatrist and neurologist. He holds high appointments. Among others he is Assistant Clinical Professor of Psychiatry at Harvard Medical School and Consultant in Psychiatry at Massachusetts General Hospital. He is a practising psychiatrist. He has made a study of various cults and taught and lectured in various countries on the medical-psychiatric aspects of forced conversions and kindred topics.

He was cross-examined at considerable length. His evidence was wholly convincing. His description of the aims and effects of auditing is supported by a mass of other evidence and refuted by none (save for the subjective but conditioned views of some of the scientologists who have given evidence) and is supported by documents of scientology, to some of which I shall refer later. His description is accurate.

In blunt language, 'auditing' is a process of conditioning, brainwashing and indoctrination.

Dr Clark was asked about other scientology cases in which he has given evidence to the same effect. I am not quite sure what the point was unless it was to show that he had become obsessive. If that was the point I can only say that he impressed me as objective, balanced, very careful and fair.

What is the fact is that it has called for very real courage to speak out as he has. I will come later to the various methods used by the 'church' of scientology as a matter of deliberate settled policy to discredit Dr Clark and any others who criticize it or, indeed, others who the 'church' thinks may in the future criticize it.

The mother complains about the cult and its practices and says that it is pernicious. Her principal complaints and my findings about them are these.

The founder: L Ron Hubbard



[1985] FLR 134

To promote himself and the cult he has made the following other false claims:

That he was a much decorated war hero. He was not.

That he commanded a corvette squadron. He did not.

That he was awarded the Purple Heart, a gallantry decoration for those wounded in action. He was not wounded and was not so decorated.

That he was crippled and blinded in the war and cured himself with dianetics techniques. He was not crippled and was not blinded.

That he was sent by US naval intelligence to break up a black magic ring in California. He was not. He was himself a member of that occult group and practised ritual sexual magic in it.

That he was a graduate of George Washington University and an atomic physicist. The facts are that he completed only 1 year of college and failed the one course in nuclear physics in which he enrolled.

There is no dispute about any of this. The evidence is unchallenged.

Hubbard, in a course called 'purification rundown' (a course which the father and step-mother recently attended, paying a high price for it), claims that it will increase the body's resistance to radioactivity. Shown this, the psychologist who gave evidence on behalf of the father described it as 'balderdash'. Shown Hubbard's writings about psychiatry and psychologists he agreed that it was 'bunkum'.

Hubbard has described himself as 'Dr Hubbard'. The only doctorate he has held is a self-bestowed 'doctorate' in scientology.

The use of false, spurious descriptions extends downwards. The deputy principal of the school where the children are at present being educated is a scientologist. At various times he has worn clerical garb and described himself as 'reverend'. And at other times as 'professor'. He did this, he accepts, for promotional reasons.

Mr Hubbard went into hiding in 1980. Attempts have been made to secure his attendance at various hearings in the courts of the United States. They have all failed because he cannot be found and served.

The evidence is clear and conclusive: Mr Hubbard is a charlatan and worse, as are his wife Mary Sue Hubbard (she has been convicted of criminal offences in the United States in connection with scientology and imprisoned) and the clique at the top privy to the cult's activities.

### Recruiting

Various promotional campaigns are carried out. A favoured method is to offer a free 'personal efficiency' test. When that has been carried out the subject is invariably advised that he or she is in need of scientology and dianetics. With the crude cynicism which informs the reality of scientology in contrast to its cosmetic appearances, potential recruits are described as 'raw meat'. The objective for adherents is to 'get the meat off the street'.



[1985] FLR 134

Locking them in

Once the fish is on the hook scientologists must go to all and any lengths to stop it wriggling free.

L Ron Hubbard writes this (HCO Bulletin -- HCO stands for 'Hubbard Communications Office' -- 29 September 1959):

'The whole dream of a PE (personal efficiency) foundation is to get the people in fast get them invoiced in a congress type assembly line, no waiting, give them hot, excited positive service and boot them on through to their HAS' [HAS is a Hubbard apprentice scientologist] 'and then worry about doing something else with them. And never let a student leave or quit -- introvert him like a bullet and get him to get audited. If he gets no reality don't let him wander out. If he walks in that door for a free PE, that's it. He doesn't get out except into an individual auditor's hands in the real tough cases, until he's an HAS.'

One of the most sinister aspects of auditing, one that shocked the father himself, is the corrupt, indeed criminal, use of the confessions made to the auditor. Hubbard has emphasized repeatedly that everything said during auditing is absolutely confidential. That assurance is given by the auditor to the person being audited.

What happens is that that person communicates to the auditor his inner-most thoughts and relates any criminal offences or transgressions of any kind, any incidents from his life which are embarrassing or for which he could be blackmailed. These statements are written down by the auditor including time, place, and a detailed description of each incident as well as who were present and knew about the incident.

Contrary to the assurance of confidentiality, all 'auditing' files are available to scientology's intelligence and enforcement bureaux and are used, if necessary to control and extort obedience from the person who was audited. If a person seeks to escape from scientology his auditing files are taken by the intelligence bureau and used, if wished, to pressure him into silence. They are often so used and uncontroverted evidence of this has been given at this hearing.

Closely connected with this is the duty of scientologists to inform on each other. This is done by means of 'knowledge reports' to 'ethics', the department responsible for discipline. Very recently (this year, 1984) one such report was sent to ethics by the step-mother about one of her closest friends; and one such report was sent by the principal of the children's school about a part-time member of the staff and the parent of a child there.

Thus is built up a very complete dossier on every scientologist for use if need be for the purposes I have mentioned.

Dated 22 December 1972 a top priority internal security project was circulated:

'This is a top priority internal security project. The information I want is to be obtained from ethics files, pc' [that is pre-clear] 'files, personnel files and interviews.



[1985] FLR 134

It may be that you will only have to, for example, look into a personnel file. If, however, you exhaust the file check, an interview will have to be done. This action can be done by your MAA [that is master at arms].

All persons on your staff who have ever been employed by a government agency; this would include a person working as an informer to any of these groups, are to be reported to me. Also, include city government, such as police departments. Add a description of the particular post said person held, with the time and connections.

This is to be done quickly and quietly.'

It is no surprise that to escape from the clutches of scientology calls for great courage and resolution. The stranglehold is tight and unrelenting and the discipline ruthless. And of course there is the anguish of conscience in the escaper after usually many years of commitment to scientology. The mother and stepfather have come through it as have others who have given evidence.

Recently some of the scientologists in East Grinstead are half way to escaping. They describe themselves as independent scientologists. They still espouse the concepts of scientology but they are in rebellion against the 'church's' practices and have left the 'church'. There are, it seems, a fair number of them and it may be that for them there is safety in numbers. I do not know.

Apostasy is a 'high crime'. High crimes are the gravest in the scientology calendar. I will come later to the punitive methods adopted to deal with apostate and others who incur the church's displeasure.

Teaching students to lie

Scientology has its own intelligence branch. One of its activities is to obtain information by falsehood and deception. Newly joined agents are trained in this and the method is described as follows. I quote verbatim:

Intelligence specialist training routine -- TR-1

Purpose: To train the student to give a false statement with good TR-1. To train the student to outflow false data effectively.

Position: Same as TR-1.

Commands: Part 1: "Tell me a lie". Command given by coach. Part 2 interview type 2 WC by coach.

Training Stress: In Part 1 coach gives command, student originates a falsehood. Coach flunks for out TR 1 or TR 0. In Part 2 coach asks questions of a student on his background or a subject. Student gives untrue data of a plausible sort that the student backs up with further explanatory data upon the coach further questions. The coach flunks for out TR 0 and TR 1, and for students fumbling on question answers. The student should be coached on a gradient until he/she can lie facily' [meaning, I suppose, 'facilely'].

'Short example:



[1985] FLR 134

Coach: Where do you come from?

Student: I come from the housewives committee on drug abuse.

Coach: But you said earlier that you were single.

Student: Well, actually I was married but am divorced. I have two kids in the suburbs where I am a housewife, in fact I'm a member of the PTA.

Coach: What town is it that you live in?

Student: West Brighton.

Coach: But there is no public school in West Brighton.

Student: I know. I send my children to school in Brighton, and that's where I'm a PTA member.

Coach: Oh, and who is the Chairman there? etc.'

Intelligence gathering and its uses

Hubbard proclaims in his public writings that the law of the country must be obeyed and no illegal activities undertaken. The following scientology directives and extracts show the hidden reality and show that what Hubbard professes is a cynical lie:

' . . . Hubbard Communications Office Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO policy letter of 20 May 1970 Guardian Public Relationships

The guardian's office handles certain publics which are its sole responsibility. These publics are as follows:

press relations

government relations

special guardian's group relations

opposition group relations

troublesome relations.

In press relations are included relations with the press, radio, television and magazines. Although the public divisions may place news releases, appear on radio or television or write stories for magazines, all such is done in co-ordination with and approved by the public relations bureau of the guardian's office. Any reporter calling the organization is routed to the guardian public relations bureau.

All relationships with governmental agencies and government officials are handled by the guardian's office or are cleared through the guardian's office. The legal bureau receives and then handles or approves all correspondence to and from government officials acting in an official capacity; and whether such are



[1985] FLR 134

local, county, district (state) or national, all are handled by the legal bureau.

The public relations bureau handles visiting government officials, all lobbying actions and carries out all public relations programmes involved with the government.

There are specialized groups which are either established by the guardian's office or with which the guardian's office is co-acting towards mutual goals. These fall under the purview of the public relations bureau.

Opposition group relations are in the sphere of the guardian's office. These opposition groups are those which are acting against scientology or against the goals of scientology.

Troublesome relations is a catchall to include all those relations which the organization has not handled with its various publics and which then wind up on guardian lines. Into this category fall business firms which sue the organization, threatening former scientologists expelled by the church, non-authorized squirrel groups, hostile members of the immediate community and so on.

Mary Sue Hubbard Controller for L Ron Hubbard Founder . . .'

Next:'. . . HCO policy letter of 15 August 1960

In the fact of danger for govts or courts there are only two errors one can make: (a) do nothing and (b) defend. The right things to do with any threat are to (1) find out if we want to play the offered game or not, (2) if not, to derail the offered game with a feint or attack upon the most vulnerable point which can be disclosed in the enemy ranks. (3) Make enough threat or clamor to cause the enemy to quail. (4) Don't try to get any money out of it. (5) Make every attack on us also sell scientology and (6) win. If attacked on some vulnerable point by anyone or anything or any organization, always find or manufacture enough threat against them to cause them to sue for peace. Peace is bought with an exchange of advantage, so make the advantage and then settle. Don't ever defend. Always attack. Don't ever do nothing. Unexpected attacks in the rear of the enemy's front ranks work best.

The goal of the department is to bring the government and hostile philosophies or societies into a state of complete compliance with the goals of scientology. This is done by high level ability to control and in its absence by low level ability to overwhelm. Introvert such agencies' [that is their word for 'infiltrate'] 'control such agencies. Scientology is the only game on earth where everybody wins. There is no overt in bringing good order . . .'

'Overt' is a wrong-doing against scientology.

Then on 9 March 1970 this letter:

'The following is a list of the successful and unsuccessful action used by intelligence.

Successful



[1985] FLR 134

Prosecuting Traitors' [that means traitors to scientology] '1. In the United States finding evidence of a crime and handing it over to the police or vice-squad. This is any crime. 2. In the United Kingdom -- finding evidence of a crime against the org' [that means 'organization'] 'and having a representaion of the church press charges for a prosecution.

Regularly getting out files and reading through them. Especially any files or cases that were handled prior to your coming on post.

If reading through files brings out a connection you were not aware of, or had forgotten, chase it up and get out the other files pertinent to the area.

All these are the files which Hubbard says are absolutely confidential.

'Use the files regularly and continuously referring to them as often as possible.

Cross-filing should not only be done under names of people but under groups and organizations as well. Also under subjects. In other words thorough cross-filing.

Use of telephoning to get simple information such as addresses, etc, rather than a personal visit.

Contacting the secretary or aide of the person you are interested in and chatting them up. Note this is very successful in getting tricky information that is not available in other areas. Is Dr so and so on his vacation now. Where is he? How long will he be gone?

Invent letterhead of some organization that is spurious, ie have it printed up and use it to make queries. Use some fairly safe address but don't be over-cautious. If you have a letterhead nobody seems to bother checking it. Examples: "Ford Foto Features" or "The Council for Human Relations in Industry". If you have a letterhead of any sort you will get answers to your questions most of the time. Of these, using a phoney news agency is the most successful.

Using 2D' [that means 'second dynamics', and it means sexual relations or relationships or family relationships] 'on someone high in the government to seduce them over to our side. This particular action was not started as an intelligence action but was more personal. It did however move into 2D activity.

Infiltrating an enemy group with the end of getting documents. These can either be about their own plans or what they have on us.

Convert third partying with forged or phoney signatures. Anonymous third partying. Particularly the internal revenue service appears to follow up every tip off they get. Getting information out of files. This is of course only vital files, not just any files.

Direct theft of documents . . .'

'Third partying' in scientology jargon is character assassination.



[1985] FLR 134

Next, 25 March 1977:

'RE: Red Box.

Dear all,

This is to introduce into BIUS the complete red box system. Most of you have heard of this earlier -- I will now explain it in detail.

First of all, all data that is red box material is attached.

Secondly, you must ensure that none of your juniors (for those of you who have them) have red box data in their areas. All the red box material from your areas must be centrally located, together and in a moveable container (ideally a briefcase), locked, and marked.

When this is done in each area, we will divide up the amounts and deputize persons in the area to be responsible for its removal from the premises in the case of a raid.

This procedure will be drilled. This procedure will stay in at the new location.

Please have all this data sorted and located in proper container by Monday night March 28. I will then divide up removal duties, and we will drill it Tuesday night just before the all hands.

Now this is the red box data.

1. What is red box data?

(a) Proof that a scientologist is involved in criminal activities.

(b) Anything illegal that implicates MSH (Mary Sue Hubbard, that is), LRH (L Ron Hubbard).

(c) Large amounts of non-FOI documents.

(d) Operations against any government group or persons.

(e) All operations that contain illegal activities.

(f) Evidence of incriminating activities.

(g) Names and details of confidential financial accounts . . .'

Those directives speak for themselves. Comment from me is unnecessary.

In 1983 those at Saint Hill, East Grinstead, tried to improve the public reputation of scientology and invited the press to look round Saint Hill Manor. A short article appeared in The Times of 17 August 1983 by its religious correspondent. One wonders whether he was shown the red box data or told of its existence or, indeed, of any other of the material which I have been quoting. I doubt it.



[1985] FLR 134

## Training courses

Courses are held on a very large number of scientology topics both in the United Kingdom and in the United States of America at 'Flag', that is the headquarters of 'Sea Org', which is the high command. They become more advanced as one advances 'across or up the bridge'. These courses, or some of them, include auditing as part of them, as I understand it.

They can be very dangerous to the mental health of the trainee and evidence has been given of instances of mental breakdown during the course of them or as the result of them.

## Discipline

Discipline is ruthless and obedience has to be unquestioning.

Scientologist working on the staff are required to work inordinately long hours for their keep and a pittance. The purpose, as Mr Armstrong describes it, pursuant to L Ron Hubbard's orders is to keep individuals impoverished so that they become completely dependent on the organization for their basic needs on a daily basis. Mr Armstrong was a scientologist for 13 years from 1969. For several of them he worked on Hubbard's personal staff and was privy to what went on in the innermost circles.

A catch-phrase constantly recurring is 'the greatest good for the greatest number of dynamics'. The step-father and his first wife were ordered to leave their little daughter full time with a baby-minder so as to put in maximum hours to 'clear the planet', this being 'for the greatest good for the greatest number of dynamics'. For several months they saw their daughter only on weekends. When he insisted on leaving earlier to bring the child home during the weekdays he was threatened with 'ethics condition', that is to say disciplinary action. On another occasion in 1976 his wife received special permission to visit a doctor because of a recurring abdominal complaint. She telephoned to say she had to go to hospital immediately. He asked if he could leave to see her. He was told 'get your stats up and you can leave at 4.30, not before'. 'Get your stats up' means 'meet your performance or productivity quota'.

Scientology must come first before family and friends. Much evidence has been given and not disputed of how it leads to alienation of one spouse from another, of alienation from children and from friends.

Another witness, Mrs B was a scientologist from 1972 and rose quickly in the organisation. She had a 3-year daughter. None the less, for a period of months she was required to work from 8.30 in the morning to 1 am the following day. She was allowed only 15 minutes daily to put her daughter to bed. On one occasion when the child broke her arm and she took her to the doctor she was directed to work all night as a penalty.

In January 1982 Mrs B was made commanding officer of the organization, Saint Hill United Kingdom Foundation. At around this time the commodore's messenger's org (that is, top management) in the United States were originating an increasing number of international directives which seemed to her to be wrong and bad. She wrote a report addressing it to L Ron Hubbard. Eight days later, in November 1982, she was removed from her post and assigned to the 'RPF' (that is, rehabilitation project force). She was refused counselling, required to



[1985] FLR 134

do at least 12 hours physical work a day (shifting bricks, emptying bins, etc) and to communicate with no one, except to receive orders. The work aggravated a chronic back condition. When she protested she was threatened with being declared a 'suppressive person' (a high crime -- see below). Her time with her children was limited to one half hour per day.

Another witness worked at 'Flag' and became an 'L Ron Hubbard public relations officer', one of only three in the world and a high appointment. In 1977 she declined to undertake a mission that would cause her to leave her young daughter for at least 2 months. She was shouted at and abused because she put the care of her child first. She was subjected to a committee of evidence (that is, a disciplinary tribunal): she left 'Flag'.

Those are a few of many illustrations, proved in evidence, of the ruthless and inhuman disciplinary measures.

Suppressive acts (SA), Suppressive persons (SP), Potential trouble sources (PTS), and Disconnection

A 'suppressive act' is any act which seniors consider to be against the interests of scientology. A 'suppressive person' is a scientologist who does a suppressive act. A 'potential trouble source' is anyone outside scientology who is opposed to the cult or anyone inside it who has been declared a suppressive person.

A scientologist who is connected with a potential trouble source -- spouse, affianced, relative, friend or business associate -- is ordered to disconnect from that person and, if that is not done, the scientologist will himself or herself be declared a suppressive person.

Very many examples have been given and proved in evidence. Two will suffice as examples.

Mrs F was a scientologist and until recently a senior staff member of the 'church' of scientology at Saint Hill Manor until -- and I quote her own words -- 'I resigned because its practices were dishonest, degrading and oppressive'. She and the deputy principal (also a scientologist as mentioned earlier) were in love and planned marriage when his divorce came through. She had been ordered to disconnect from a close woman friend. She discussed this and her disenchantment with scientology with her fiance. He was subjected to an 'ethics interview' at Saint Hill and the school. He wrote her a letter dated 16 January 1984:

Dear [so and so],

I have done conditions and decided that I am a scientologist before all and do not wish to have any opposition to the church on my lines. I agree with the disconnection of technology when a person commits a suppressive act, to assist them to confront and handle their behaviour. I believe that outnesses or disagreements can be handled on church lines. I believe there is no survival off these lines. I believe that I must not compromise my position and that your only hope lies in resolving your problems with the terminals here at Saint Hill. I believe that you should take advantage of the help offered to get any false data corrected and any out-ethics handled.



[1985] FLR 134

I believe I have not been firm in cutting entheta lines and so have allowed a dwindling spiral for us both. I believe you are a remarkable being who I wanted to share an ethical future with.

Please listen to me, sweetheart, See the RTC mission and hear their data. Let's live within the church's protection.

If you will not do this for me and you, then I must disconnect, as I cannot believe you are acting for our survival. It's not a connection of "your integrity", it's a question of survival along all dynamics . . .'

The father had a business associate and close friend. He incurred the church's disfavour -- he was declared a suppressive person, I think -- and he and the father fell apart and had a business dispute. The father wrote him this letter dated 6 April 1983 with copies to the 'justice chief international' and the 'special unit world wide':

Dear [so and so],

You have since your return in January behaved in a destructive and suppressive way towards me and my company.

In his recent Journal 37, LRH says that any suppressive person seeking to dissuade or invalidate one deals only in lies. And that truth blows the lies away.

You are dealing in lies. Your non confront, unwillingness to communicate, not-is-ness and lies have added complexity to the situation:

1. You proceeded contrary to our agreement, to enter into a carpet supply business using the same comm lines as the cleaning company. This without any reference to me.
2. You have attempted to hold me to a "connection" with you as a declared SP knowing that such connection would prevent me from progressing in scientology. You have done this by refusing direct communication between us on to the two outstanding matters of taxation and the valuation of the companies.
3. Rather than communication and confront of these subjects you have interjected a firm of solicitors, two of whom are declared SP's again with the knowledge of the difficulty this would create. You have apparently instructed these solicitors to act against me based on lies.
4. You have been obstructive, suppressively so, in the matter of your vacating the premises, and to my idea of the workable solution of the partition.
5. You have taken up with Ron Hopkins, a declared and expelled SP and thereby introduced another suppressive element into the premises and thus onto my lines.

I have thought long and hard about you of late. I have recently done a very thorough PTS C/S 1 course at AOSH' [that is Saint Hill].

'Your actions, attitudes and intentions are compatible with those of LRH data on SP's. What you are now doing in setting yourself against the church is not only very suppressive but also non-survival for you, your family and any group



[1985] FLR 134

you are associated with.

My advice to you would be to stop your suppressive actions and drop all your SP connections and get yourself to IJC' [that is international justice chief] 'and get this scene handled now.

I have regretablely no illusions about your accepting this . . .'

Punishment and persecution

I have already mentiioned some of the forms of punishment and examples of their use. There is more where the 'church's' enemies are concerned -- suppressive persons and critics.

'Fair game policy'

In his HCO policy letter of 18 October 1967, L Ron Hubbard, founder, directed:

'Penalties for lower condition (applies both orgs and sea org).

Liability -- suspension of pay and a dirty grey rag on left arm and day and night confinement to org premises.

Treason' [that means to say, treason against scientology] -- 'suspension of pay and deprivation of all uniforms and insignia, a black mark on left cheek and confinement on org premises or dismissal from post and debarment from premises.

Doubt -- debarment from premises. Not to be employed. Payment of fine amounting to any sum may have cost org. Not to be trained or processed. Not to be communicated or argued with.

Enemy -- SP order. Fair game. May be deprived of property or injured by means of any scientologist without any discipline of the scientologist. May be tricked, sued or lied to or destroyed.

L Ron Hubbard

Founder. . .'

In his HCO policy letter of 21 October 1968, Hubbard directed:

'Cancellation of fair game.

The practice of declaring people fair game will cease. Fair game may not appear on any ethics order. It causes bad public relations. This PL' [that is policy letter] 'does not cancel any policy on the treatment or handling of an SP.

L Ron Hubbard

Founder. . .'

It was suggested, but not pursued, that this did cancel the fair game treatment. It did nothing of the kind as the last sentence shows. It was



[1985] FLR 134

cosmetic only for public consumption. Deprivation of property, injury by any means, trickery, suing, lying or destruction have been pursued throughout and to this day with the fullest possible vigour.

To give two illustrations: Beginning in 1977 the church of scientology have conducted a campaign of persecution against Dr Clark. They wrote letters to the Dean at the Harvard Medical School and to the Director of the Massachusetts General Hospital. But they refused to gag him. Their agents tracked down and telephoned several of his patients and interviewed his neighbours looking for evidence to impugn his private or personal actions. They submitted a critical report to a committee of the Massachusetts State Senate. On three occasions during the last 5 years a scientology 'front' called the Citizens' Commission on Human Rights have brought complaints against him to the Massachusetts Medical Board of Registration alleging improper professional conduct. In 1980 he was declared a 'number one enemy' and in 1981 they brought two law suits against him (summarily dismissed, but costly and worrying). They distributed leaflets at the Massachusetts General Hospital offering a \$25,000 reward to employees for evidence which would lead to his conviction on any charge of criminal activity. They stole his employment record from another Boston hospital. They convened press conferences calculated to ruin his professional reputation. It all failed, but that is of minor importance to scientology. 'Throw enough mud and some will stick'. It has caused him heavy cost in time and money and anxiety.

Mr Armstrong points out that the claim that 'fair game' has been cancelled is untrue. He was declared 'fair game'. They disseminated stories internationally, falsely accusing him of theft, hired paid bullies to harass him and his wife day and night for over a month, they threatened his life, they assaulted him and they hit him with a car.

### Black Propaganda

By HCO policy letter of 11 May 1971 Hubbard directed:

'Black PR. About the most involved employment of PR is its covert use in destroying the repute of individuals and groups. More correctly this is technically called black propaganda.'

### Use of the courts

'Level 'O' checksheet by L Ron Hubbard:

The purpose of the suit is to harass and discourage rather than to win.

The law can be used very easily to harass, and enough harassment on somebody who is simply on the thin edge anyway, well knowing that he is not authorized, will generally be sufficient to cause his professional decease.'

And then this directive concludes with these words:

'If possible, of course, ruin him utterly.'

Some of the scientology jargon in its own documents, which I have been citing, may not be clear to someone who has not had to undergo the task of having them explained over the weeks. But their meaning is clear and they show out of the cult's own mouth the frightening, disgraceful and illegal lengths to



[1985] FLR 134

which it is prepared to go and does go.

There has been harassment of the mother and step-father in this case. The father sent the documents in the case to the 'church' who in turn sent them with directions to the head of their guardian's office in the town where the mother and step-father lived. They tried to persuade them to discontinue the proceedings. If they did not they would be interfering with the 'spiritual progress' of the children and would be expelled from the 'church'. They refused. Soon afterwards one of the step-father's company's employees, a scientologist, resigned his job. He told the step-father that this was because he was 'engaging in suppressive acts'. He said that he had not wished to leave the company but had been ordered to do so by the 'church'.

I was informed of this at the hearing for directions in January 1984. I warned that any continuance or repetition would be severely dealt with and it is right to say that there has been none.

Now at the end of this case I repeat publicly what I said then: The powers of this court are wide and its arm is long. If there is any intimidation or harassment of any description of anyone connected with this case it will be dealt with with the utmost severity.

#### Money

##### The cost of 'services'

The prices charged by scientology for auditing or courses are very high, often running into thousands of pounds. A scientologist, although 'clear' is required to go on being audited and taking courses to advance up the bridge for all of which he has to pay.

Over the period of 15 months before the chaplain's court in May 1980, the father and step-mother paid into scientology £8,000 at Saint Hill and £6,500 at 'Flag', a total of £14,500. They have continued throughout the years to go on courses and being audited and have paid large sums of money. They plan to go on doing so and, indeed, will be subjected to harsh disciplinary methods if they do not.

No recruit or scientologist can have these services without the paying for them. There is no tempering of the wind to a shorn lamb.

Scientology claimed recently that they would 'clear the planet' within 5 years. Herein is a paradox. How can they clear all pre-clears when the majority cannot possibly hope to pay? But, I suppose, it is swallowed by the adherents just as everything else is. Their reasoning powers have been blocked out.

#### Apparatus and materials

There is a very long list of these and scientologists are expected to buy at heavy costs.

An example is the 'E meter'. Hubbard in his book Scientology: The Fundamentals of Thought describes it as follows:



[1985] FLR 134

'The Hubbard electrometer is a religious artifact used in the church confessional. It, in itself, does nothing, and is used by ministers only to assist parishioners in locating areas of spiritual distress or travail.'

'Ministers' are auditors. 'Parishioners' are people being audited.

That is the description of it for public consumption. Privately it is used as a means of intimidation (see the US Mission Holders Conference below).

Dr Clark described it as a crude lie-detector. The psychologist, already mentioned, describes it as a psychogalvanometer, costing @28.50. The father and step-mother have one in their house which they bought some years ago. It cost them about @400.

'Regging'

This is the word used to describe extorting money.

Examples proved in evidence and not challenged are:

Two people were persuaded to sell their respective houses. Proceeds were used to pay for scientologist services. Both were left with virtually no assets.

A man was persuaded to pay the entirety of his worker's compensation payment, approximately \$18,000, towards 'services'.

A man was persuaded to pay \$52,000 out of a settlement awarded to him for permanent injuries from a motorcycle accident.

A married couple were persuaded to pay \$105,000 by selling off a large part of the wife's inherited stocks and shares.

A man undergoing chemotherapy for terminal lymphatic cancer was persuaded to pay \$24,000.

These are examples only.

The US Mission Holders' Conference, San Francisco 1982

Missioners are those in charge of scientology missions whose function it is to proselytize and get people into scientology.

They were summoned to a 'conference' in San Francisco to be addressed by 'top officials of the sea organization'. These persons are given the appellations of naval ranks. Hubbard is the 'commodore'.

The top officials were a 'captain' and two 'commanders'. They took it in turns to harangue the unfortunate missioners. Present were scientology's own police and 'masters at arms' (MAAs). The whole burden of the harangue was get more money in or else. They had to double their quota of recruits. They had to pay \$15,000 a day for investigators. They had to get rid of certain publications and buy others. Each one had to buy a projector for \$2,000 and so on. If they did not comply they were going to be punished and 'you'll be meter-tested' or 'get the E meter'.



[1985] FLR 134

For those of us old enough to remember, it is grimly reminiscent of the ranting and bullying of Hitler and his henchmen.

It gives the flavour of the reality of what scientology is and does. I include the transcript of the mission holders' conference as an appendix to this judgment. Counsel were agreed that the first 30 pages are irrelevant and these are not included.

'Make more money'

In HCO policy letter of 9 March 1972, Hubbard directed:

'Governing policy

The governing policy of finance is to:

A. Make money

B. Buy more money made with allocations for expense (bean theory).

C. Do not commit expense beyond future ability to pay.

D. Don't ever borrow.

E. Know different types of orgs and what they do.

F. Understand money flow lines not only in an org but org to org as customers flow upward.' [I think customers flowing upwards means scientologists advancing up the bridge.]

G. Understand exchange of valuables or service for money . . .' [and there is a reference to policy letter Exec Series 3 and 4].

H. Know the correct money pools for any given activity.

I. Police all lines constantly.

J. Make money.

K. Make more money.

L. Make other people produce so as to make money.'

What happens to the money?

Mr Armstrong is in a better position than most to know where the money goes. His evidence, together with other evidence, shows that most of it goes into the pocket of Hubbard and he has described how it is 'laundered'.

The children's school

It is the mother's case that the school is under the control of the 'church' of scientology in East Grinstead.



[1985] FLR 134

The father's case is that it is entirely independent of scientology.

It is not disputed that of 89 pupils all but 7 or 8 are the children of scientologists; save for 2 or 3 temporary or part-time staff, the principal, deputy principal and all the staff are scientologists. The governors or managers are the board of trustees. All of them are scientologists, one of them being the father.

Scientology as such is not taught as a subject. But all the ambiance is of scientology, and it is plain that the 'church' exercises a strong influence if not, indeed, control.

A pupil wrote a letter which the principal circulated as a 'success story'. It reflects scientology language and notions.

I have already mentioned the 'knowledge report' sent to the 'church' by the principal about a parent. Another scientology parent who had fallen foul of the 'church' and was not 'in good standing' was ordered to remove her children. The principal was called to account by 'ethics' for allowing a scientologist who had incurred the 'church's' displeasure to attend the school fair.

The school pays money annually to scientology.

The facts speak for themselves.

Scientology's indoctrination of children

The objective of scientology is to capture the child and its mind.

The auditing -- the processing -- begins at an early age. In child Dianetics 1968 edn, Hubbard writes:

'It is possible to process a child at any age level beyond the point when he learns to speak. However, no serious processing should be undertaken until the child is at least 5. Extensive dianetic processing is not encouraged, except in very unusual circumstances, until the child is at least 8 years of age.'

In The Second Dymanic 1982 edn, under the heading 'Children's Confessional Ages 6-12' is a 'processing check for use on children'. It is a very long and rigorous interrogation.

Dr Clark says this:

'Among children's many development needs is the capacity to deal with strangers and diverse interests. A child brought up strictly within the closed system of scientology would tend not to develop these capacities and instead look upon the non "cleared" outside world as a totally alien culture.

The "technical processes" used by scientology to educate children are mind-focusing, hypnotic and anaesthetic. Such states of mind, which are induced in order to secure lifetime allegiance of scientology, can mask real disease.

Children need human nurturance from human -- that is to say fallible -- models in order to become autonomous and adaptive over a lifetime. The experience of stressful and manipulative scientology training not only



[1985] FLR 134

consumes a great deal of time unconstructively, but it favours identification with the process rather than with human, parental authorities.'

In Booklet 2 of the Professional Court (1982) Hubbard writes:

'A very effective thought control technique could also be worked out from scientology which could be used to make individuals into willing slaves.'

In my judgment that technique has been worked out and is operated. I agree with Dr Clark that 'scientology training is training for slavery'.

Dr Clark adds:

'Children also become damaged pawns in family conflicts as the result of scientology policy which teaches people how to manipulate others. One sees the untoward effects of this policy within the family home when the groups work to alienate a child from a spouse who has incurred the "church's" disapproval and who must be shunned by any means available. A prescribed tactic often used to this effect is called "third-partying" by which a child can be subtly alienated from a parent who may not be acceptable to the "church" of scientology by blaming problems and conflicts on the non-conforming spouse or other close family members. Apart from direct psychic damage, a most significant result of this process is that the child loses half of his parental nurturance.'

There is a large, a very large, body of evidence, most of it undisputed, in this case supporting Dr Clark's analysis and I am left in no doubt that he is right.

A sad episode during the hearing was the evidence of a young man. He is greatly gifted and did exceptionally well at school and university. His parents are scientologists as are his brother and sister. They are all totally committed. He did his first simple course at the age of 6 and a further basic course, 'The Hubbard qualified scientologist course', 2 years later. Since then he has continued with course after course. He was cross-examined gently by Mr Kennedy. It became apparent that he simply could not accept that there was or could be anything wrong with scientology. The part of his mind which would otherwise have been capable of weighing objectively the criticism of scientology had been blocked out by the processing. He has indeed been enslaved. Mr Kennedy coined an accurate shorthand phrase to describe this: 'scientology blindness'.

Is there a good side to scientology?

Lifting the ban

Some reliance is placed by the father on the lifting of 'the ban'. In July 1968 the then Government imposed immigration restrictions on non-British students of scientology. In July 1980 the ban was lifted. The Home Secretary announced this in a written answer (No 123) in these terms.

'Yes, this policy which applies to scientology alone was announced in 1968 by the then Minister of Health who stated that scientology was socially harmful and that its methods could be a serious danger to the health of those submitted to them. My Right Hon Friend the Secretary of State for Social Services is not satisfied that there is clear and sufficient evidence for continuing the



[1985] FLR 134

existing policy with regard to scientologists on medical grounds alone. I have accordingly decided that the ban be lifted.'

The inference, it is suggested, is that scientology is not harmful. Well, the Home Secretary's answer is in very guarded terms. I do not know what material the Department of Social Services had. It did not consult the views of Dr Clark and his like-minded colleagues. I doubt whether it had the documents which have been proved in this case. I cannot properly attach any weight to it.

It followed intensive propaganda by the 'church' and lobbying of MPs and others in which the father played a very active and time-consuming part.

Narconon

This is a campaign against drug abuse participated in by scientology. It seems to have had some success and has been much publicized as such by scientology. Credit for it is somewhat diminished by the evidence of Mrs B, who was in a position to know and who says that part of the funds raised for it were syphoned off to Hubbard.

'A religion'

Scientology approached a large number of theologians and other savants on the question whether scientology is a religion. These have been put in evidence. The definitions vary. Some of them would embrace such cults as satanism or devil-worship. Their purpose was to try to obtain acknowledgement that scientology was a 'religion' within the meaning of certain fiscal enactments and so obtain tax immunity. They succeeded in Australia on appeal to the High Court of Australia from the decision of the Full Court of the Supreme Court of Victoria.

The question whether scientology is or is not a 'religion' for tax purposes seems to me to have nothing to do with the issues I have to decide. If all this material was put in evidence to suggest that the courts of Australia have been satisfied as to the rectitude of scientology no such suggestion is warranted. In the courts of Victoria it was found to be a 'sham'. The High Court of Australia neither affirmed nor dissented from that description. Adopting the definition of 'religion' that it did, it was not necessary to do so. The question, in the view of the High Court, was not whether Mr Hubbard and the persons in ultimate command were charlatans, but whether the adherents believed in them and their ideas, observances and practices. The adherents accord 'blind reverence', said the High Court of Australia, to the written works of Mr Hubbard and so there was a 'religion' for the purposes of the legislation in question.

I have searched and searched carefully for anything good, some redeeming feature, in scientology. I can find nothing, unless it be such participation as there has been in the anti-drug abuse campaign.

Conclusion as to scientology

In Re T (Minors) (1981) 2 FLR 239 (decided in 1975) the Court of Appeal was concerned with children one of whose parents was a member of another and very different sect. In the course of his judgment at p 244H Scarman LJ (as he then was) stressed that:



[1985] FLR 134

'It is conceded that there is nothing immoral or socially obnoxious in the beliefs and practices of this sect.'

Scientology is both immoral and socially obnoxious. Mr Kennedy did not exaggerate when he termed it 'pernicious'. In my judgment it is corrupt, sinister and dangerous. It is corrupt because it is based on lies and deceit and has as its real objective money and power for Mr Hubbard, his wife and those close to him at the top. It is sinister because it indulges in infamous practices both to its adherents who do not toe the line unquestioningly and to those outside who criticize or oppose it. It is dangerous because it is out to capture people, especially children and impressionable young people, and indoctrinate and brainwash them so that they become the unquestioning captives and tools of the cult, withdrawn from ordinary thought, living and relationships with others.

### The future of B and G

To summarize first what counsel have conveniently described as the conventional factors, B and G have been with their father and step-mother for 5 1/2 years and with their step-brother, J, and half-brother. They are cherished by their paternal grandparents and by their step-mother's parents. It is a warm close family circle in which they are well cared for and thriving. They love them all and are loved by them all.

The mother loves them and has kept in close, regular contact with them in England and the country in which she has settled with the step-father and to which they wish to return. They love her and are fond of the step-father. She too has a close family circle waiting for them, sisters with children whom B and G already know. And there is their half-sister A. The mother impressed me as a very nice sensible and honest young lady. The step-father too left an altogether favourable impression.

The father and step-mother also impressed me as a very nice couple save in those parts where they are poisoned by scientology. A couple who are not scientologists gave evidence. They are not close. They are more acquaintances than friends. The link is their daughter's friendship with G. They speak of the father and step-mother as a nice, normal couple with a happy family life with the children.

The family doctor gave evidence to the same effect. She did say that she has seen little of them and the children. She is not herself a scientologist but has scientologists among her patients in East Grinstead. She said that her scientologist patients consult her less often than do the others. This is not surprising. Hubbard is opposed to orthodox medicine in general, proclaiming that his own methods are better, and strictly, a scientologist has to obtain permission to seek orthodox medical treatment. Their previous doctor was a scientologist in East Grinstead. But he has recently led a campaign against the 'church' methods and practices and especially its exorbitant charges for auditing and courses. He is no longer 'in good standing' with the 'church' and is no longer the family's doctor. But I am confident that the children's physical health is not neglected especially by the step-mother who appears to me, rightly or wrongly to be less fanatically dedicated to scientology than the father. It is, of course, the children's personalities and individualities and their freedom of choice and to grow up as normal young people which is the cause for concern.



[1985] FLR 134

If the children were to go into their mother's care they would not, of course, be going to strangers or to an institution. None the less, they would be leaving what has been their real home and family circle. It would be an upheaval. It would certainly be confusing and, I think, probably seriously distressing for them for a time.

Although there are factors on both sides, if the matter rested there I would judge that it would be in the better interest of the children for there to be no upheaval while ensuring very ample access to their mother.

Does the scientology factor tip the scales the other way?

Both the father and the step-mother have been scientologists for many years. They are totally committed, as they agree. They have continuously been audited and undergone courses. They have paid very large sums of money.

Mr Kennedy suggested that the father has lied when it has suited himself or scientology. Mr Kennedy certainly cannot be criticized as making that suggestion groundlessly.

Two example out of several are these:

The father in the witness-box professed respect for British justice as the best in the world. In his submission to the chaplain's court he said, and I quote: 'There was no similarity between wog law and justice'.

In his affidavit sworn on 14 June the father deposed:

'... there is no effort or attempt on my part to indoctrinate the children with the beliefs of scientology, although there must be a natural "rubbing-off" on them of certain facets of my beliefs'. [And] '... it is my belief that all my children should be free to make up their own minds about scientology and whether to pursue it, when they are old enough to make a decision. I have no intention of forcing any of my children to become scientologists, to take scientology courses or to be audited.'

That is not true. There is more than one way of 'forcing'.

In his submission to the chaplain's court he said:

'I really wanted to keep the children with me as a prosurvival urge for them and me to bring them up as worthwhile intelligent fulfilled beings using scientology tech' ['tech' means 'technique'] ... 'It is our intention to raise the children as intelligent worthwhile people using scientology tech and policy. This is being achieved.'

He has audited B and J. The children have been taught 'contact assists' and 'touch assists', two allegedly healing techniques. The two boys have had two sessions of a form of training or auditing which involved sitting facing each other for half-an-hour. They have been removed from their previous schools and put into the scientology-controlled school. They have been taken to 'Flag' in the United States. With one or two exceptions all their friends are the children of scientologists.



All this has begun to make its mark on the children.

Recently B asked the mother whether he could have a certain friend to stay for the weekend when with her 'because he's the only one whose parents will let him to come to your house'.

Recently G asked her mother why she was not a scientologist. Her mother pointed out that people could be good people without being scientologists and observed that two widely respected personages in whom G is interested were not scientologists. To this G replied 'they would be better if they were'.

If they were to remain with the father and step-mother without conditions the process would go on with all the consequences to the children earlier described including, inevitably an ultimately, alienation from their mother. It would be nothing short of disastrous for them.

At the end of the hearing Mr Johnson suggested that what is best of the status quo (that is to say living with and being cared for by the father and step-mother with the other children) could be preserved while being cut off from scientology until they are grown up and can make their own minds up. He acknowledged that this would mean that the father and step-mother would have to sever any connection with scientology, the family would have to move from East Grinstead, and the children removed from their school. It was not mentioned, but in fact it would mean a similar cutting off of J and S. And I was left wondering whether the full implications had been thought about and grasped by the father and step-mother.

Mr Johnson told me that consideration had been given to seeking some appropriate dispensation from the 'church' but it was not thought that this would be forthcoming. That is not surprising. What is proposed is the ultimate heresy -- a 'high crime'.

Would what is now proposed be the most advantageous of the options for the children? I do not think so. The father and step-mother remain totally committed to scientology. After much of the evidence had been given and they had read the written material (mainly consisting of scientology's own documents) I hoped that their eyes might be opened and said that if that happened they should feel free to tell their advisers and the court. They did not. They did say that they 'might stand back' from scientology while the children are growing up. I am afraid that that did not carry conviction. They remain afflicted by 'scientology blindness'. The father said that he would seek to correct the evils disclosed during the hearing. But what could he do against the power of the 'church'? Nothing. The result would be that he would be declared a suppressive person with all that that would entail for him and his family. Apart from the upheaval, new environment, new home, new school, new friends, the pressures of the 'church' and of their own beliefs and consciences would be far too much for them. And to cut themselves and all the children off from scientology would have traumatic and emotional consequences on them and through them on the children.

The baleful influence of the 'church' would in reality still be there and the children would remain gravely at risk.

One cannot, alas, attribute so many ounces or pounds to this factor and so much to that and so much to the other and then do the resulting adding and



[1985] FLR 134

subtracting.

Weighing up all the factors, including the scientology one, I have reached the conclusion that in the interests of the children now and in the future the scales come down in favour of them making their home with their mother and come down that way decisively.

Accordingly, they will be committed to the care and control of their mother with leave to take them out of the jurisdiction to live in the country in which she and the step-father have settled and where, I should add, I am satisfied that the material and educational facilities are satisfactory.

This does not mean that they will be cut off from their father and the rest of his family. That would indeed seriously upset them. They love him as he does them. They will stay with him regularly. There will probably have to be conditions but they should be easy to observe and not interrupt his wife, himself and their other children in the practice of their beliefs.

This has been a very lengthy judgment mainly because of many verbatim recitals of scientology's own documents whose authenticity is not disputed. I have taken that course deliberately. The 'church' resorts to lies and deceit whenever it thinks it will profit it to do so. It will, I think, find it less easy to gull and dupe others in the face of its own documents and, so far as its practices, methods and objectives are concerned, there will be less scope to counter this decision about these children on any factual basis.

DISPOSITION:

Children committed to care and control of the mother.

SOLICITORS:

Tweedie & Prideaux for the mother: Stephen M Bird & Co for the father.

APPENDIX:

Extract from transcript of the US mission holders' conference at San Francisco in 1982 (see [1985] FLR p 152).

Cmdr David Miscavige: One thing the Executive Director International went over that's needed from the missions is Book One auditing, as a major action from missions: Getting new public in and getting them on Book One. Aside from the quota or whatever, that's what's needed. Book One auditing. That's the bottom of the bridge, lots of Book One auditing. Doesn't take a lot of resources to deliver it, you all know that. So Book 1 is needed from missions and in a big way.

Next person that's going to be speaking is Commander Wendell Reynolds. He is the International Finance Dictator. And he's also going to be talking about the promotion for this Book One Campaign and the upcoming Book One promotion.

Mr Reynolds.

Audience: (Applause.)

Cmdr Wendell Reynolds, International Finance Dictator: All right now, collectively you guys are in some weird lower condition. By association if no other reason you have allowed the missions to go squirrel and I mean squirrel.



[1985] FLR 134

Now, I don't know if you're aware of this but the Finance Network has recently been beefed up and we have an FBO and Deputy FBO on post in just about every org on the planet. The Deputy FBO's job is to drive public in on the orgs and the FBO's job is to get those public serviced. Now, right now you guys are CI on my lines, maybe one exception in this room, but I doubt it, because you guys are sitting on public, you're ripping off the orgs, you're doing all manner of crazy things.

Now, we are going in on the orgs and we're finding this stuff. The \$250,000 that Stevens Creek has regged from people who had already gone Clear over the last few months -- somebody's already paid for it and there are some more dues to be paid on that one. I'm not going to have this stuff.

Now some of these guys you see standing around here are International Finance Police and their job is to go out and find this stuff and if you guys are guilty of it, you've just had it! So, are we talking the same language here, now?

Anybody have any doubts about this one? (Pause) Okay.

The old routine here was you got Scientology justice procedures applied to you when you did something wrong. Well you guys are a separate corporation from the Church and when you rip-off or steal from the org, or bribe people it's a corporate crime and you can be real sure that you're going to all end up in the slammer.

Now, I figure that you guys owe these orgs, I don't know how many millions of dollars, how many hundreds of thousands of pcs from the rip-offs, collectively speaking. And I say collectively because you guys by association are taking on the condition that you failed to assign. And if you read the policy 'How to Assign Conditions' you will see that the condition that you fail to assign you will take on. And there are people in this audience, right now, who are wholesale ripping off orgs. Anyone want to volunteer that they're doing it? Nobody here will volunteer? COSMOD San Francisco here? Are you COSMOD San Francisco? Is COSMOD San Francisco here? Is that you? Do you agree? I'm going to put you on the meter later on if you say no.

Someone in the audience: Me?

Cmdr Wendell Reynolds: No, him. Okay?

I want some dues paid on this and I don't want these public coming into these orgs on these quotas to be the guys you're giving back having ripped them off. These are new people. Anybody ripping off comes back just as they went off the lines. No ifs, ands or buts. No walking into the org, take the pc folders and take them up to the missions, none of that stuff. You guys are a flow up, not a flow down and not a holding action.

Now, this convention is costing the Church money. You're all paying 75 bucks a head for the joy of listening to this whole thing so you get put into proper reality. You're all going to sign your 5% minimum CGI donation to this DMSMH Campaign. Do you realize if the missions paid for the campaign as a whole it would take you guys some 200 weeks of you current payment level? Four years. You could never afford to do it and yet just having in the phone book "Dianetics" and "Scientology" is going to get you a bundle of public in. You're not getting more information cards from the orgs, nothing!



[1985] FLR 134

You're gonna get Dianetics and Scientology as a household word. And even the top PR experts available to us, who've been planning this whole thing out with targets and so forth so this thing is going to fly. And if you look at it Battlefield Earth has been released on the same pattern as the early 1950s when LRH was a popular writer with DMSMH released right, right on the heels of it and that put it right on the best-seller list. And right now Battlefield Earth is selling out and selling out and selling out again. So we got a tremendous popularity thing going and you guys are getting a gift at 5% of CGI -- it's a total gift. So if I hear one person in this room who is not coughing up 5% as a minimum you've got an investigation coming your way because you got other crimes in your mission. Questions of that?

Do you guys have an unreality on the rip-offs that are going from orgs? Do you have some unreality about Academics being delivered in missions? Academy Levels?

Any unreality about people who have gone Clear being kept or re-reged in the mission? There's one example of a person being reged for 52 intensives after going Clear in a mission.

Do you have any idea about the penalties for taking public off the orgs' lines -- it's \$10,000 a head per policy. If you rip-off a staff member or have a staff member working in your mission at the same time he's employed by an org you pay for the entirety of his training processing plus a \$2,000 fine. And that will all be enforced in addition on the mission in addition to any individual penalties leveled in a criminal nature. Is that all real clear? Okay.

We're talking PT now. Whatever you had going in the past is whatever you had going in the past. Lines drawn right here and right now. You guys are going to all write up your O/Ws tonight. Before you leave and you'll get meter checked. And I want everybody straight -- on yourselves and anybody else that you know. And if you don't come clean and I find out something later on that P/L is enforced. You are guilty of anything that you didn't report on. Right per that P/L. We talk the same language?

Audience: Uh-huh.

Cmdr Wendell Reynolds: Any questions? Anyone want to leave? Okay.

If we will pull this thing together and get all these nuts off the line and actually do Dianetics and Scientology you can go anyplace you want to go. Right now there is so much criminality floating through this mission network I don't want to hear about it. IF you come clean we'll work out some reparations for all the rip-offs that you've done in the past and straighten the record. If you don't want to come clean, forget it. If you've done stuff in the past and you come clean now we'll give you the benefit of the doubt. We'll assume that you weren't hatted or you were misdirected or something else. You don't come clean tonight and I find out something after this, man, you've had it. That's all I have to say.

Audience: (Applause.)

Cmdr David Miscavige: Just a recap on everybody, because that was actually the last speaker. As you basically see we have a new corporate structure,



[1985] FLR 134

have a new organization. There's flowlines. There's new management. The infiltration days are over, the bribe days are over, the anything-goes days are over. What goes is standard policy. What goes is people flowing through the bottom of the bridge up the bridge. What goes is no rip-offs. I was in San Francisco Org today and a Mission Holder from Seattle came in to get an org pc. Well that person's paying \$10,000 and her mission status is being reviewed. Now I don't want to close down a bunch of missions.

But I will tell you something -- somebody who's going to rip-off orgs and not apply policy then obviously they're not about to apply Scientology tech either. So therefore I don't trust them and we're better off without them.

Just so you know where we stand. Now we can all get along easily if policy is applied. We're not talking about anything else. We're not giving any whimsical rules. Because of all out-ethics that's gone on in the last two years specific things like the Mission Holders "Mutiny".

That's just not going to go on anymore. That hurts everybody and it's at an end. So we had to get real tough and we've gotten tough. Our organization will not be violated. Neither legally or ecclesiastically.

Standard Tech, Standard Policy, that's the name of the game. And because we mean business we're going to go legal. We will prosecute. If you take a look at it any person who starts to take rip-offs, should've been getting more people into the mission or into the orgs and by actually getting a lot of missions and orgs functioning and everybody would be prosperous. The rip-off artist makes everone suffer and work harder. It's an everybody loses situation. So what we've done is set up everything so it's an everybody wins situation. The rule of the game are laid out. There's nothing else, there are no arbitraries. But as I stated, there will be no rip-offs or out-tech tolerated. Those are the rules. And they will be stuck to.

There's no more "do whatever you want", "we don't care as long as your stats are up". That's nuts. And in every case we investigated where these upstats were going on in the face of out-tech and off-policy, we find that they were false stats. So apply policy, apply tech, apply the flowlines of the bridge and there's policy on that for missions, and we all win. Okay?

Next thing is we have some MAAs over here; they're going to pass out some paper -- as Mr Reynolds pointed out, we're going to have O/W write-ups and the \$75 collection to pay for this convention and Knowledge Reports. Standard Knowledge Reports. So right now is the time to come clean and get a fresh start. Everybody in agreement?

Audience: Yup (agrees).

Cmdr David Miscavige: Okay. Pass them out.

(Sounds of paper shuffling and talking in the audience. Break for O/W write-ups and Knowledge Reports.)

(Recommencement of conference.)

Cmdr Wendell Reynolds: Now the procedure which we have worked out for how to square the books on this whole thing is that we are going to record every



[1985] FLR 134

point of inflow from organizations into missions. And you will do that by returning to your missions and require O W write ups and knowledge reports from all your staff to fully document all the points of inflow into the mission from orgs. And that will be pcs, students, staff, mailing lists, people reged for mission services beyond the point they should have gone to a higher org. Academy levels, anything else which has been delivered in violation of the intention of missions and that is intended to represent accurately the entire overt on orgs of the mission since the day it started. And we are going to start with the COSMOD Mission: and the Stevens Creek and we are going to send teams in who will be doing meter checks at the end of all the write-ups and verifying the estimation.

Do you have a question of this, do you get what I am saying?

(Person raises hand.)

Cmdr Wendell Reynolds: Yeah?

Person: I don't quite understand what you mean about, I understand but I'm not quite getting the outflow, inflow into the missions from the org.

Cmdr Wendell Reynolds: Inflow to the missions from the orgs.

Person: From the orgs.

Cmdr Wendell Reynolds: Yeah. The flow, the flow from missions is up the Bridge to orgs. OK.

Everything which flows from the org down to the mission is an overt of the flow on the Bridge.

Person: I got it.

Cmdr Wendell Reynolds: And that is essentially what we are addressing here. What we are trying to do is erase an engram which has been in place for some time and that is going to take more than just cleaning up your own universe. It is going to take some physical universe action.

Person: Right.

Cmdr Wendell Reynolds: There's factually a liability condition that exists. And in some cases, some of the mission it is going to appear perhaps insurmountable and yet you will find that by actually handling the overt you will then unleash the potential of the mission to start to flow up the Bridge.

If we don't handle that, as an overt and as an engram we are going to be stuck with the wrong condition on the Bridge and it will not flow.

So the intention is, all the backlog off the line. Clean the slate and once we've got the full estimation we will work out with the individual Mission Holder how that's going to be repaid to the orgs. Because in some cases it is going to be in the millions of dollars like COSMOD, it is going to be in the millions margin.



[1985] FLR 134

Stevens Creek, we already know: it is quarter of a million over the last couple of months of people who were reged after they went Dianetic Clear. That is all overt. That's all going to get cleaned up.

On the teams that will be going in: will be to verify by meter check the accuracy of what's going on and to do physical universe inspections of the actual records, the past files, the pc folders and so forth of the org. I mean I'm sorry for the mission. And we will get all that as straight as it can be gotten. And we will reorient these flows up the line.

So that is the basic orientation. We will start with those two, which are the biggest chains and then we are going to go around the rest of the US and then we are going to go to the NON US.

We are just going to end this whole game once and for good and even the score. And then from there, it is all up line.

My postulate is that everybody comes fully clean, if you have mission staff. Like some of the Mission Holders said that they don't know what went on in the mission. Well that is inexcusable. You are still responsible for what went on there and it will be treated in that vein.

So, you are to go back and find out from your staff what actually has been going on and the entirety of what has been going on all the way back to day one of the mission. I want to just clean that up.

So we will send in some teams who are outside and won't have mutual rudiments with the mission to assist on the meter checks on that. And if you have staff that won't come clear they will be ordered to Flag for sec check either at the mission expense or at their own expense at preferential rates. And they will get a full sec check until the actual scene is brought out. Brought out into the open.

You will probably find that you have attracted certain staff who are there for the wrong reasons, who will have to be sorted out and that is just the way it goes. But that is the basic game plan and that is the basic way that we can win on this thing. So, do I have your agreement on that?

Audience: Yes.

Cmdr Wendell Reynolds: Okay, All your knowledge reports and so forth are to be sent to Int Finance Ethics Officer at Flag and you should keep a copy of everything in the mission so that when the mission comes in to do the verifications and meter checks and so forth they will have the raw data as well as having a full data bank at Flag.

And I am sure we will get various and sundry things to be cleaned up and the intention here is to clean it up.

We don't necessarily like to declare people or handle ethics except where it is necessary for the "greatest good for the greatest number of dynamics", in which case we do it wholeheartedly.

And you can just tell your mission staff and I am sure that you have got the message by now yourselves, that we are not goofing around. That this planet



[1985] FLR 134

is a mud bowl and it is going to stay that way unless we fix it. And the determination I believe is appearing in this room to make that actually happen on the organizational pattern as laid out by LRH.

So having your full support on that will be of assistance. If we don't have it it is going to be too bad for you. So go back and give that message to your Mission staff and let's get this thing straightened out and moving.

What you say?

Audience: Yes!

Cmdr Wendell Reynolds: Okay. Thank you.

Audience: (Applause).

Capt Guillaume Lesevre: All right. So you've got your quotas. You guys all written down your quotas?

Audience: Yes.

Capt Guillaume Lesevre: Pcs and students to orgs. Very good.

Now. Now you've got to double those quotas of new people you are going to start on services. Just take those quotas, double them for the week on people you are going to start in the mission for the first time on services.

Because I tell you something. I've told it to you before, you are going to have to start to reaching out for the new public. All right.

Now on those quotas, the public, the people you are going to send back to the orgs that belong there. You know. People are gotten there this year starting in the orgs that you are going to have to, this week, re-send back to the orgs. They don't count on those quotas. Is that clear?'

Audience: Yes.

Capt Guillaume Lesevre: The pcs and students that you are going to send those orgs have never seen them. All right.

Now, reading some of these O/Ws, we see that we've got a whole bunch of cycles. You know. You've got a lot of cycles to handle now. To clean up that stuff. You know, Academy levels sold, ah, people over-reged after Dianetic Clear and things like that. You are going to have to start to handle that tomorrow. Right away.

You should, when you go back, you should make a list, you know, and write down all those cycles to start cleaning them up and ending them.

I mean, those teams that are going to come to the Missions you know, your missions are going to be paying for it. Now if you start to handle your own scene, you know, fast, this week, you will be saving some money as well.

Cmdr Wendell Reynolds: The price for the missions coming in to do the verifications will be \$15,000 a day. You can save yourselves a lot of time



[1985] FLR 134

and expense if you just get your whole act together. You can either meter-check your staff in advance if you want to, whatever you want to do. So the missions can come in and just verify the whole thing and as much preps as you do is the faster it is going to happen. If they are there for a long time, it will be expensive. If they're not it won't be as expensive. They'll be paid at the start of each day that they are there.

Capt Guillaume Lesevre: Good.

If I were you, I'd start getting going on that right tomorrow, okay?

Audience: Yes.

Capt Guillaume Lesevre: The other thing I want to say is, I want to stress again -- this is the moment when we're going to find out who is with us and who is not with us.

I can tell you something. I had so much trouble with missions in the past that in one country in Europe I forbade that there were any missions. It was forbidden in that country. That was Italy. Now that country is a country that is expanding the most, where scientology expanded the fastest on the whole planet. No missions, not one.

I'm not saying that there shouldn't be missions. That is just to show we don't owe anything to the world. We don't have to have anybody. Is that clear?

Audience: Yes.

Capt Guillaume Lesevre: Okay. Now you have double quotas on the pcs and students that you are going to send to orgs of new people you are going to start on basic services, right?

Now when you come back, I suggest definitely that you get rid of all those Ruth Minshull and Peter Gillnam and other publications and you just get on LRH books. Just go down in your reception in your bookstore and just get those other books out of there.

Because what do you want to do? You want to get on Source and you want to have a stand out intro line. Really stand out intro line. Now in order to do that, you got to get the projector. You got to show the LRH Film, like the Freedom Film and then you got to deliver your Book One auditing and train Book One auditors.

That is what is needed and wanted. And that is how you are going to do it.

All right. Now before you leave, outside they have this table with two persons from the Golden Era Studio and each one of you is going to get a projector. It is \$2,000. Each one of you is going to get a projector. How many of you guys have got a projector in his mission now?

Okay. Those that don't have a projector, get a projector before you leave from here. Then you are going to get the Freedom Film and you are going to start showing that.



[1985] FLR 134

Okay. We are going to get that whole scene completely stand (stamped) out and on policy and on Source. Every single last bit of it. Okay?

Audience: Right. Great.

Capt Guillaume Lesevre: Very good.

Anyone of you here been using a thing called the Counsellor Ad?

Audience: Yes.

Capt Guillaume Lesevre: Who has been using that?

Audience: (Raise of hands.)

Capt Guillaume Lesevre: All right. That ad shouldn't be used. Okay? It has been misused. And it is misleading. Okay?

People come in. They come for a certain reason, and then they find out that is not what is being offered to them. Don't use that ad.

Getting standard new public procurement actions. You can Body routing. You distribute fliers, FSMs. Show them films, Intro Lectures, Book One auditing. Cancel that ad now. Cancel it. Its no good.

SMI will be giving you a new ad to put up. But in the meanwhile don't wait for it. Cancel that ad right now an get on all the other procurement actions. Okay?

Audience: Okay. Yeah.

Capt Guillaume Lesevre: All right.

Audience: (Applause.)

Cmdr David Miscavige: Okay. The last two things.

One is, I don't know, I guess you guys will be talking to other Mission Holders once you leave. Correct?

Audience: Right.

Cmdr David Miscavige: I believe all the Mission Holders in the US were called to come to this meeting and several didn't. You might want to just tell them one thing.

Just a message. They will be getting the message anyway, but you will probably be quicker, I know how fast the rumor lines or the phone lines are.

We have run across something recently whereby there's a little technique of make wrong when someone tries to put in ethics. It's actually a suppressive make wrong. It goes 'If you put in ethics, we're going to crash our stats to show you that you can't put our ethics in and that is a wrong indication'.



[1985] FLR 134

Tell them we don't buy it. If it happens they will get a mission. A Sea Org mission to their mission. Okay? Just a little message.

Last thing I wanted to mention is, now is the chance to straighten out everything. It really is a chance to start on a new road up, fresh. It is only going to happen with all these cycles which Mr Reynolds and the ED Int spoke about and if you do that, you are on the winning team. We are winning legally. We are winning statistically. And scientology is going up.

I just want to let you know that because that is the plus point of it all. And we will win in the end. Okay?

Audience: Right.